REMARKS

The enclosed is responsive to the Advisory Action Office Action mailed on March 31, 2005 and is being filed pursuant to a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) as provided under 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application. By way of the present response the Applicants have: 1) amended claim 1; 2) added no new claims; and 3) canceled no claims. As such, claims 1-50 are now pending. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application and the allowance of all claims now presented.

Claims 1-50 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ben-Shaul et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0010798). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Applicants contend that this reference does not disclose all of the limitations of Applicants' claims. Ben-Shaul teaches deploying secondary web servers (called "edge servers") to cache, store, and deliver web content to an end user. (Paragraphs 0072 and 0214.) An end user makes a request to an "origin" website only to have the request redirected to the edge server and the edge server supplies the web content to the end user. (Paragraphs 0072 and 0214.) The content provider or end user controls the behavior of the edge server by defining service profiles. (Paragraphs 215 and 229.)

With respect to Applicants' claim 1, Applicants re-assert that Ben-Shaul does not disclose "permitting the enhanced content programming to be provided to the

receiver in response to the user request <u>only if the content provider is an authorized</u> <u>content provider</u>." The Final Office Action cites paragraphs 219 and 426 and Table 2 as support that Ben-Shaul does disclose this element. Applicants agree that Ben-Shaul discloses an edge server that is "a subordinate software server that resides in an 'edge' of the internet and provides enhanced content delivery services to users on behalf of one or more origin servers."

However, Ben-Shaul discloses that the <u>user has to be authorized</u> not the content provider. "It is possible, however, that the content provider permits downloading of such content <u>only after the user requesting the material has been</u> <u>authorized</u> or otherwise properly identified." (Paragraph 0426.) Ben-Shaul allows the content provider to assure that the content is being used properly or at least used by the proper person. The Applicants' require <u>the content provider to be</u> <u>authorized and not the user</u>. This allows a network operator can better control what content is on his network. At least for this reason, Ben-Shaul does not teach all of the elements of the claim 1.

Claims 2-7 are dependent on claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-7 are not anticipated for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

With respect to the remaining claims 8-50, Applicants respectfully re-assert their earlier arguments which are copied below. Applicants respectfully request that these arguments be addressed so that Applicants may better address Examiner's concerns regarding these claims.

With respect to Applicants' claim 8, Applicants re-assert that Ben-Shaul does not teach or disclose "appending additional parameters to said user request."

Applicants' claim 8 appends additional parameters to a user request. Ben-Shaul instead discloses redirecting a user request to the appropriate edge server based on either what the user is requesting or the attributes of the user (paragraphs 72 and 107). Ben-Shaul also does not teach or disclose "extracting transaction information from the user request response sent by the content provider." At least for these reasons, Ben-Shaul does not teach all of the elements of the claim 8. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection has been successfully traversed.

Claims 9-27 are dependent on claim 8. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 9-27 are not anticipated for at least the same reasons as claim 8 and that the rejections are successfully traversed.

With respect to Applicants' claim 28, Applicants re-assert that Ben-Shaul does not teach or disclose "detecting triggers within said portion of said enhanced broadcast information." It does not teach detecting triggers of any sort. Nor does Ben-Shaul does teach or disclose Claim "appending third party parameters to said intercepted user request." It instead discloses redirecting a user request to the appropriate edge server based on either what the user is requesting or the attributes of the user but nothing is added to the request. (Paragraphs 72 and 107.) Any attribute of the user that is sent out is stored in a cookie, however, this cookie is only transferred when the user makes a request and is not appended after the edge server receives the request. (Paragraph 107.) At least for these reasons, Ben-Shaul does not teach all of the elements of the claim 28. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection has been successfully traversed.

Claims 29-41 are dependent on claim 28. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 29-41 are not anticipated for at least the same reasons as claim 28 and that the rejections are successfully traversed.

Applicants' claim 42 is directed to a system for providing enhanced content programming to a user. Applicants re-assert that Ben-Shaul does not teach or disclose a third party "means for appending operation parameters to said request" or "means for directing said appended request to said content provider." Requests are redirected to an edge server (not a third party) that determines what content should be distributed from the edge server. (Paragraph 220.) Nor does Ben-Shaul teach "third party means for intercepting a response to said request initiated by said content provider." The edge server simply distributes the content requested. (Paragraph 220.) At least for these reasons, Ben-Shaul does not teach all of the elements of the claim 42. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection has been successfully traversed.

Claims 43-50 are dependent on claim 42. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 43-50 are not anticipated for at least the same reasons as claim 42 and that the rejections are successfully traversed.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome by the amendments and remarks, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejections be withdrawn and the pending claims be allowed.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: _____4/6/65_____   _____
Daniel M. DeVos
Reg. No. 37,813

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300